UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,831	03/30/2001	Edward V. Gamsaragan	42390.P10234	6121

7590 09/26/2007

John P. Ward
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER	
LIANG, REGINA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2629	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/823,831	GAMSARAGAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Regina Liang	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 August 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *55-70* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *55-70* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is responsive to amendment filed 8/2/07. Claims 55-70 are pending in the application.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 60, 66, 67, 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson et al (US 6,028,764) in view of Ishizawa et al (US 5,347,630 hereinafter Ishizawa).

As to claims 60, 67, Figs. 1 and 2 of Richardson discloses a portable computer comprising: a base station of the portable computer (12), wherein the base station comprises a processor (32 in Fig. 7) and a communication adapter (54a in Fig. 7; 84 in Fig. 9), and a computing display subsystem (14) of the portable computer, the computing display subsystem detachably connectable to the base station see Fig. 2). Richardson also discloses the computing display subsystem (14) including: a second communication adapter (54b in Fig. 7; 82 in Fig. 9) to allow the computing display subsystem to communicate with the base station when the computing display subsystem is detached from the base station (col. 2, lines 3-5; col. 3, lines 8-14, 50-54) and a battery (60 in Fig. 7, col. 3, lines 18-21), wherein the computing display subsystem wirelessly communicates with the base via the communication adapter, wherein the communication adapter including one or more of an infrared adapter and a radio frequency adapter (see the abstract and col. 3, lines 31-32, 50-57).

Richardson does not disclose the display subsystem comprising a storage device, a processor, and a display controller. Ishizawa is cited to teach a computer system having a detachable display similar to Richardson. Fig. 1 of Ishizawa teaches a portable display device having a main unit (3) and a display subsystem (6), the display subsystem (6) is attachable to and detachable from the main unit (3). Fig. 5 of Ishizawa teaches the display subsystem (6) comprising a storage device (VRAM 78), a processor (CPU) and a display controller (79). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the display subsystem of Richardson to have the display components as taught by Ishizawa so as because the subsystem can be operated independently by using own processor even detaching from the main computer and to provide an information processing system which materially enhances the portability while maintaining high operability (col. 1, lines 31-34 of Ishizawa).

As to claims 66, 70, Richardson discloses the display could be a touch screen and has screen inputs (col. 3, lines 47-49), Ishizawa teaches the display is LCD display. It is inherent that a touch screen including an I/O controller for detecting a touch position on the touch screen. The combination of Richardson and Ishizawa would provide a writeable liquid crystal display.

4. Claims 61-63, 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson and Ishizawa as applied to claim 60 and 67 above, and further in view of Mital (US 5,878,282).

As to claims 61, 68, Richardson as modified by Ishizawa does not disclose the storage device (VRAM) comprises a non-volatile storage device. However, it is well known in the art

that RAM is a non-volatile memory (col. 6, lines 34-35 of Mital). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the storage device of Richardson as modified by Ishizawa to comprise a non-volatile storage device so as to maintain the data after the power is turned off (col. 6, lines 36-37 of Mital).

As to claims 62, 63, it is well known in the art that the non-volatile storage device can be a flash memory or a hard disk drive.

5. Claims 64, 65, 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson and Ishizawa as applied to claim 60 and 67 above, and further in view of Parrish (US 6,704,879).

As to claims 64, 69, Richardson as modified by Ishizawa does not explicitly disclose the processor of the computing display subsystem is operable at a high frequency power mode when the display subsystem is connected to the base unit, and at a lower frequency power mode when the display subsystem is detached from the base unit.

However, Richardson teaches the computing display subsystem having its own battery power supply (60 in Fig. 6) and the display subsystem is operable either by battery power supply or by AC power source (col. 3, lines 18-30). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the display subsystem Richardson as modified by Ishizawa to be operated by AC power source when the display subsystem is connected to the base unit and operated by a battery power supply when the display subsystem is detached from the base unit so as to allow the display subsystem to be operated independently and remote from the base unit.

Furthermore, Parrish is cited to teach a processor of a computer device is operable at a high power mode when it is connect to an AC power source and at a lower frequency power mode when it is used own DC power source (col. 2, lines 27-45). Thus, it would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Richardson as modified by Ishizawa to have the feature of the high or lower frequency operation by using AC power source or battery power supply as taught by Parrish because Parrish provides a method to reduce power consumption in a computer system (col. 1, lines 36-37).

As to claim 65, Ishizawa teaches computer system is operable to operate using Inter SpeedStep Technology (col. 4, lines 19-21).

6. Claims 55-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson, Ishizawa and Parrish, and further in view of Mital (US 5,878,282).

As to claim 55, note the discussion of claims 60, 67, 64, 69 above. Richardson as modified by Ishizawa and Parrish does not disclose the storage device (VRAM) comprises a non-volatile storage device. However, it is well known in the art that RAM is a non-volatile memory (col. 6, lines 34-35 of Mital). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the storage device of Richardson as modified by Ishizawa and Parrish to comprise a non-volatile storage device so as to maintain the data after the power is turned off (col. 6, lines 36-37 of Mital).

As to claims 56, 57, it is well known in the art that the non-volatile storage device can be a flash memory or a hard disk drive.

As to claim 58, Ishizawa teaches computer system is operable to operate using Inter SpeedStep Technology (col. 4, lines 19-21).

As to claim 59, Richardson discloses the display could be a touch screen and has screen inputs (col. 3, lines 47-49), Ishizawa teaches the display is LCD display. It is inherent that a touch screen including an I/O controller for detecting a touch position on the touch screen. The combination of Richardson and Ishizawa would provide a writeable liquid crystal display.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 8/2/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's remarks regarding claims 55, 60, 67 are not persuasive. Richardson (in the abstract) discloses a "portable computer includes a display screen which is detachably connected to the remainder of the computer. When the screen is detached, communication may continue between the screen and the housing using one of a plurality of techniques, including infrared communication, radio frequency communications, or an extensible cable link. In this way, a display screen may be positioned at a more convenient location, for example for viewing by a plurality of viewers." (emphasis added). Clearly, Richardson discloses "the computing display subsystem wirelessly communicates with the base via the communication adapter, wherein the communication adapter includes one or more of an infrared adapter and radio frequency adapter" as claimed in the independent claims 55, 60 and 67.

Applicant's remarks regarding all dependent claims 56-59, 61-66, 68-70 are not persuasive since the independent claims are not allowable over Richardson as modified.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Regina Liang whose telephone number is (571) 272-7693. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe, can be reached on (571) 272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Regina Liang
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2674

9/20/07